



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|---------------|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| 09/473,246 | 12/27/1999 | MARK W. SCHAEFER | 012006-00254 | 9751 |
| . 75 | 90 02/04/2003 | | | |
| DAVID W BROWNLEE ECKERT SEAMANS CHERIN 7 MELLOTT LLC 600 GRANT STREET 44TH FLOOR | | | EXAMINER | |
| | | | ANGEBRANNDT, MARTIN J | |
| PITTSBURGH, | PA 15219 | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 1756 | 1. 9 |
| | | | DATE MAILED: 02/04/2003 | , |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | _ | | | | |
|--|---|---|---------------------------------|--|--|--|
| 1 | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | | |
| Advisory Action | 09/473,246 | SCHAEFER ET AL. | | | | |
| Advisory Addon | Examiner | Art Unit | | | | |
| | Martin J Angebranndt | 1756 | | | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ears on the cover sheet with the o | orrespondence addres | s | | | |
| THE REPLY FILED 13 January 2003 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. | void abandonment of this applica) a timely filed amendment whic | ation. A proper reply to h places the application | o a n in | | | |
| PERIOD FOR RE | EPLY [check either a) or b)] | | | | | |
| a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The | Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth later than SIX MONTHS from the mailin S FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF TH | g date of the final rejection. HE FINAL REJECTION. Sec | e MPEP | | | |
| fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Officimely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 (| of extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply ce later than three months after the mai | ount of the fee. The appropri originally set in the final Offi | iate extension ce action; or | | | |
| A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR) | | | | | | |
| 2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be | ecause: | | | | | |
| (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); | | | | | | |
| (b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below); | | | | | | |
| (c) they are not deemed to place the application i issues for appeal; and/or | n better form for appeal by mate | rially reducing or simpl | lifying the | | | |
| (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. | | | | | | |
| NOTE: | | | | | | |
| Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject | ion(s): <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . | | | | | |
| 4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s). | be allowable if submitted in a se | eparate, timely filed am | endment | | | |
| 5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: Se | | idered but does NOT p | lace the | | | |
| 6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered bed raised by the Examiner in the final rejection. | ause it is not directed SOLELY t | to issues which were no | ewly | | | |
| 7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we | | | an | | | |
| The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) allowed: | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) objected to: | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) rejected: | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: | | | | | | |
| 8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner. | | | | | | |
| 9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen | nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s) | // , | | | | |
| 10. Other: | | afth | - - | | | |
| | | Martin/J Angebranndt Primary Examiner Art Unit: 1756 | | | | |

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTO-303 (Rev. 04-01)



Continuation of 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): the rejection under rule 135(b) is withdrawn and the rejection not corresponding to the count (claims 1-4 and 7-25) are considered allowable based upon the delcaration of Mark Schaefer, Thomas Levendusky, Simon Shou, Robert Larson and Neville Whittle filed on 08/24/2001 which include evidence showing reducetion to practice (drafting of application) prior to the filing of Mentz et al...

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The issue of interference has not been addressed. The applicant is informed that all claims are considered allowable. However, due to a potnetial interference, exparte prosecution is SUSPENDED-FOR-A-PERIOD-OF-SIX-MONTHS from the date of this letter. Upon expiration of the period of suspension, applicant should make an inquiry as to the status of the application.